



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/439,225	11/12/1999	CARLOS SALDANHA	1162.007US1	1407
21186	7590 03/25/2003			
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 29 MINNEAPO	DLIS, MN 55402		HAVAN, THU THAO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2672	10
			DATE MAILED: 03/25/2003	18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	6
•			
Office Action Summary	09/439,225	SALDANHA ET AL.	
omce Action Cummary	Examiner	Art Unit	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	Thu-Thao Havan	with the correspondence address	
Period for Reply	pears on the sover errest		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	136(a). In no event, however, may ply within the statutory minimum of t d will apply and will expire SIX (6) M te, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	<u>November 2002</u> .		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow			
closed in accordance with the practice unde Disposition of Claims	r Ex parte Quayle, 1935	J.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the application	on.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc			
Applicant may not request that any objection to to 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in r		disapproved by the Examiner.	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	an priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	g., p.,, a.,	3 (=) (=) (-)	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri			
application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	stic priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application	1).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language p 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome			
Attachment(s)	, , ,	•	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 Notice	ew Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)

Art Unit: 2672

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims **1-45** are pending in the present application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed November 25, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Rom, Volino, and Sakaguchi teach the claimed limitations.

Rom teaches virtual dressing over the Internet for displaying garments over the Internet as through the garments were being draped over the body of the user (col.1, line 48 to col. 3, line.46). In that Rom teaches generating rendering frames containing mannequin or garment objects as defined by selected parameter values by shape blending corresponding objects of previously generated rendering frames (col. 1, line 53 to col. 2, line 11; col. 7-8; figs. 1-3). In other words, Rom teaches fitting articles of clothing to an image of a user over the Internet. The image of the user is used to adjust the spatial configuration of the clothing. That is the shape blending fact is the article of clothing adjusted to match critical points of the image of the body of the user.

While Voline and Sakaguchi teaches that it's well known to generate three dimensional rendering frame of the mannequin wearing the garment (Voline—page 42; Sakaguchi—page 1). Both Voline and Sakaguchi teach simulating clothes on virtual actors so that the images of the respective patterns are three-dimensional form. Sakaguchi specifically teaches a stereoscopic image of the garment is generated by connecting the deformed 3D images of the respective patterns based on the information on the garment. On a further note, in the previous office action Examiner only

Art Unit: 2672

addresses Voline and Sakaguchi as teaching three dimensional while Rom as teaching two dimensional in relation to simulating garments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims **1-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rom (US patent no. 6,307,568) in view of non-patent literature Volino, P., et al., ("An Evolving System for Simulating Clothes on Virtual Actors", <u>Computer Graphics in Textiles and Apparel</u>, 42-51, (September 1996)) and further in view of Sakaguchi (CA patent no. 2,259,788).

Re claims 1, 16, 19, 29, 32, 34, 38, and 44, the prior art Rom had:

- A.) Simulating draping and collision of the garment with the mannequin within the simulation scene to generate frame of the mannequin wearing the garment (col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 11; col. 5, lines 3-13; abstract). In other words, Rom teaches a virtual dressing method for displaying garments were the garments were being draped and cling (i.e. collision) over the body of the image of a user.
- B.) Constraining portions of the garment to reside within or outside of particular shells defined around the mannequin in the rendering frame (col. 2, lines 34-42; fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2672

In other words, Rom determines garment adjustment points of the garment spatial configuration. The determining points are the particular shells that defined the spatial configuration of the image.

C.) Generating rendering frames containing mannequin or garment objects as defined by selected parameter values by shape blending corresponding objects of previously generated rendering frames (col. 1, line 53 to col. 2, line 11; col. 7-8; figs. 1-3). In other words, Rom teaches fitting articles of clothing to an image of a user over the Internet. The image of the user is used to adjust the spatial configuration of the clothing. That is the shape blending fact is the article of clothing adjusted to match critical points of the image of the body of the user.

Rom fails to specifically disclose a method for producing an image of a computer-simulated mannequin wearing a garment as defined by selected mannequin and garment parameter values, comprising of generating objects corresponding to a representative mannequin and a garment placed in a simulation scene within a three-dimensional modeling environment.

However, Volino specifically teaches a method for producing an image of a computer-simulated mannequin wearing a garment as defined by selected mannequin and garment parameter values, comprising of generating objects corresponding to a representative mannequin and a garment placed in a simulation scene within a three-dimensional modeling environment (pages 42, 44, and 48). In other words, Volino teaches computer simulating clothes on a mannequin to visualize collisions and draping of the garment (page 42). The simulation software of Volino consisting of data structure

Art Unit: 2672

that stores all object information which computes all objects in the structure (<u>page 44</u>). Furthermore, the 3D simulation process constructs the garment design (<u>page 48</u>).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Rom and Volino as a whole, it would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Volino to the system of Rom because doing so would have enabled simulating clothes on a mannequin using computer virtual dressing as noted in Volino (pages 42, 44, and 48).

Rom and Volino fail to specifically disclose generating rendering frames containing mannequin or garment objects as defined by selected parameter values by shape blending corresponding objects of previously generated rendering frames.

However, Sakaguchi specifically teaches generating rendering frames containing mannequin or garment objects as defined by selected parameter values by shape blending corresponding objects of previously generated rendering frames (page 31-second paragraph to page 33). In other words, Sakaguchi using the index (i.e. parameter values) to shape the garment. The frame of the garment is generated by clicking the mouse to bring the cursor K to the input window for the shape of the garment.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Rom and Volino as a whole, it would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Sakaguchi to the system of Rom and Volino because doing so would have enabled generating the shape of the garment for different users with different model of the garment as noted in Sakaguchi (page 31-second paragraph to page 33 and page 35; page 66; fig. 23-25).

Art Unit: 2672

4

Re claims **2**, **35**, **and 43**, Rom discloses the rendered image is used to form a visual image on a computer display device (<u>col. 6</u>, <u>lines 13-19</u>; <u>fig. 2</u>). In other words, Rom teaches the final output of the image is displaying on the GUI.

Re claims **5**, **23**, **42** and **45**, Rom discloses the two-dimensional images are rendered from a rendering frame using a plurality of camera positions (<u>col. 6</u>, <u>lines 33-45</u>). In other words, Rom teaches a digital camera that captures the user's position then incorporated into the computer to render the user's image for the particular garment.

Re claims **10-12** and **39**, Sakaguchi discloses the separate rendering frames are combined into a composite two-dimensional image using Z-coordinates of the objects (page 66 to 68). Sakaguchi teaches calculating different frames with different indices or points for the shape of garment.

Re claims **14-15**, Sakaguchi discloses a network and a processor-executable instructions (<u>fig. 13</u>). In figure 13, Sakaguchi uses the network system by using the Internet and Intranet for his system. Furthermore, the application consisting of an executable instruction.

Re claims **3-4, 6-9, 13, 17-18, 20-22, 24-28, 30-31, 33, 36, 40-41**, the limitations of these claims are analyzed as discussed with respect to claims 1, 16, 19, 29, 32, 34, 38, and 44 above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2672

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu-Thao Havan whose telephone number is (703) 308-7062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703) 305-4713.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Art Unit: 2672

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Thu-Thao Havan

March 12, 2003

Page 8

JEFFERY EFIER